

June 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13817

WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
Worcester, Mass., June 11, 1965.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I am writing to inform you of my personal support of your bill Senate No. 9 extending the GI bill to veterans of the cold war.

In view of the circumstances taking place in Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic, it would seem that veterans, like myself, who served after January 31, 1955, should be eligible for the benefits included in your proposed legislation.

Many thanks for your interest in us.

Sincerely,

PHILIP J. DOHERTY,
Assistant Development Director.

FE *[Signature]*
COMMUNIST HARASSMENT OF
VIETNAM SERVICEMEN'S KIN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there is no more cruel or more fiendish form of harassment than that practiced by anonymous telephone callers who use the telephone as an instrument of terror or of torment.

We are accustomed to thinking of these "telephone terrorists," as either criminals or crackpots.

Certainly this is true in most cases. But it is not commonly realized that this merciless weapon is also used in a calculated political manner by the Communist movement against its opponents in this country and in other free countries.

The evidence is now accumulating that we are confronting an organized campaign of telephone harassment of Vietnam servicemen's families, the only conceivable purpose of which can be to undermine the morale, or seek to undermine the morale, of our forces in Vietnam.

The first such instance was reported in the New York Times on June 10. The widow of Capt. Christopher O'Sullivan, a 28-year-old Army captain killed in Vietnam, received a number of anonymous calls and letters. The first caller said to her about her husband:

He didn't belong in Vietnam in the first place. Your husband got what he deserved. I am glad * * * it serves him right.

The Times reported that this call shocked Mrs. O'Sullivan so much that she fainted. Later she had her telephone number changed to an unlisted one. But when the funeral for Captain O'Sullivan was held on June 10, Police Commissioner Vincent Broderick personally commanded a 30-man security force to cope with the possibility of any demonstration.

An AP dispatch from Da Nang, Vietnam, yesterday, reports that American servicemen are reacting with bitterness and anger to reports from home that their wives and families are being subjected to harassing calls from people opposed to U.S. involvement in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert into the Record an article from the New York Times of June 10, and the AP dispatch from the Baltimore Sun of this morning's date, dealing with this matter.

The AP dispatch to which I have referred spoke of the telephone callers as cranks. At another point it suggested that the calls may have originated with so-called antiwar groups.

These are interpretations I cannot accept.

I am certain that no member of a pacifist movement, no matter how opposed he might be to our presence in Vietnam, would resort to this kind of inhuman tactic.

For that matter, I find it difficult to believe that even psychopathic or criminal elements could stoop to such base inhumanity.

The nature of the call, and past experiences with similar campaigns of harassment, suggest that what is involved here is the organized apparatus of the American Communist Party.

I recall that when Judge Irving Kaufman, one of this country's most eminent jurists, presided over the trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, and passed sentence of death on them after their conviction by the jury, both Judge Kaufman and his wife were harassed by telephone calls for months on end, at all hours of the day and night. They changed their phone number several times, but each time the Communists, in some way, discovered their new number, and the campaign of harassment began all over again. This entire sordid story was the subject of an article in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "The Ordeal of Judge Kaufman."

Mr. President, words cannot express the contempt that I feel for those who, for political motivation, stoop to tactics so base and inhuman. I am certain that this feeling of contempt is shared by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

It is my hope that at least some of those involved in this national campaign of telephone harassment will be brought to book so that the American people may get a clearer look at them and so that we will have an opportunity to learn something about their political motivation and associations.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1965]

POLICE GUARD RITES FOR VIETNAM HERO

Police Commissioner Vincent Broderick commanded a 30-man security force today at the funeral of an Army captain killed in Vietnam. The victim's family had been subjected to gloating anonymous calls and unsigned letters.

A high police official said it had been feared that the funeral of 28-year-old Capt. Christopher O'Sullivan would be turned into a demonstration against U.S. intervention in Vietnam.

The security force was stationed both inside the Immaculate Conception Roman Catholic Church in Astoria, Queens, and for two blocks around it. Two police riot vans were parked nearby.

But no demonstration was staged.

After the Ranger company commander's death May 30, his widow began receiving the calls and letters. Members of the family said they contained such statements as:

"He didn't belong in Vietnam in the first

place * * * Your husband got what he deserved * * * I'm glad * * * It serves you right."

The first call shocked Mrs. O'Sullivan so much that she fainted. Later she had her telephone number changed and unlisted. She lives in Astoria with their two sons, 3 and 4.

[From the Baltimore Sun]

ANTIWAR HECKLING OF KIN RANKLE GI'S IN VIETNAM

DA NANG, VIETNAM, June 20.—American servicemen here are reacting with bitterness and anger at reports from home that their wives and families are being subjected to crank calls from people opposed to U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

Ranking American officers feel the attacks upon the servicemen's families could, in time, adversely affect morale among the fighting men in South Vietnam.

A number of the U.S. servicemen have reported to their superiors that their parents or wives have been approached by so-called antiwar groups.

IT SERVES YOU RIGHT

Some of the servicemen expressed extreme bitterness over the case involving the widow of Army Capt. Christopher O'Sullivan, of Queens, N.Y. O'Sullivan was killed and the Vietnamese unit he advised was virtually wiped out on Memorial Day.

Soon afterward Mrs. O'Sullivan received anonymous telephone calls and letters saying "Your husband got what he deserved." "It serves you right." "He didn't belong in Vietnam in the first place."

Newspaper clippings reporting the incident in New York quickly circulated through Da Nang, where O'Sullivan had been stationed.

An Air Force pilot who did not know O'Sullivan said, "How could anyone do something like that even though they thought the war is wrong."

Col. Howard St. Clair, of Columbus, Ga., senior American adviser to the Vietnamese 1st Army Corps, said of the O'Sullivan incident:

"This is my third war and I can't recall anything like this before. It's disgusting, but I don't believe it has had any appreciable effect on morale. If it continues, then we would have a problem."

Mrs. O'Sullivan, who lives with her two sons, was forced to obtain an unlisted telephone number. A number of servicemen here reported their wives had done the same thing because of calls or the threat of them.

An Army major reported that several persons called on his wife and tried to convince her that he was trapped in sin because of the "evil war in Vietnam."

"They will be stoning the wounded at home soon, just like they did in France during the Indochina war," the veteran of 11 months in Vietnam said.

Most servicemen asked about the situation requested not to be quoted by name because of the fear of pressure on their families.

A Marine helicopter door gunner said, "A lot of us are going to get zapped (killed or wounded) over here. They tell us we're here to stop communism. But some of the newspaper clippings I've been getting from home make it sound like some people think we're the aggressors and not the Communists. That's just nuts."

PILOT'S OPINION

A pilot said, "They do us a lot of damage. I get about as upset about those college kids who want to send medicine to the Vietcong as I do by the Communists."

A Special Forces sergeant said, "I wonder if those kids aren't secretly worried about

the war lasting long enough that they will have to fight it themselves."

Many servicemen write off segments of antiwar feeling in the United States as the product of what one called the oddball left. Some GI's who have attended college believe the teach-ins and protests in colleges are youths attempting to establish identity through protest for its own sake.

WHOLE THING HURTS

"Hell, some of them will wind up rich bankers and doctors worried about the crank ideas of their own kids," an officer in an armored outfit said. "But the whole thing hurts, nonetheless."

A staff sergeant said, "Most of those people who are so hot to tell the world what vicious animals we are would change their minds pretty quickly if they could come here and see the war as it is."

"I saw a lot of dead civilians during Korea; but I never saw atrocities like the VC (Vietcong) have pulled."

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER SUPPORTS PENDING BIRTH-CONTROL LEGISLATION—REPORT ON HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 1676

Mr. GRUENING, Mr. President, hearings opened today on Senate bill 1676 and related bills, which seek to coordinate birth-control information and to make it available, upon request, in the United States and overseas.

A part of the motivation of the hearings is found in President Lyndon Johnson's state of the Union pledge, when he said:

I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources.

Giving information to the people "is the most certain and the most legitimate engine of government"; so wrote Thomas Jefferson, 178 years ago, to his friend, James Madison.

Today, another President—a past President—has also spoken; today, the Senate Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, of which I am chairman, and which is holding hearings on Senate bill 1676 and related bills, received a thoughtful and illuminating statement from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. He told the subcommittee that he is delighted that it "is concerning itself with this subject," one that he considers "constitutes one of the most, if not the most, critical problem facing mankind today."

Former President Eisenhower said quite frankly that he does not "believe it to be the function of the Federal Government to interfere in the social structure of other nations by using, except through private institutions, American resources to assist them in a partial stabilization of their numbers. I expressed this view publicly, but soon abandoned it."

The facts available caused former President Eisenhower to change his opinion. He said, in his statement:

If we now ignore the plight of those unborn generations which, because of our unreadiness to take corrective action in controlling population growth, will be denied any expectations beyond abject poverty and suffering, then history will rightly condemn us.

He calls for the cooperation of the Federal Government and appropriate private and semipublic organizations, so that "the necessary human and material resources can be promptly mobilized and employed to cope effectively with the great need of slowing down and finally stabilizing the growth in the world's population."

His statement this morning on this worldwide problem of increasing population is a valuable and historical contribution to the public dialog.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of former President Eisenhower's reasoned statement be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING, Mr. President, testifying in person today before the subcommittee were the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], Representative PAUL H. TODD, Jr., of Michigan, Representative MORRIS K. UDALL, of Arizona, and Representative D. R. "BILLY" MATTHEWS, of Florida.

The hearings continue tomorrow, Wednesday, June 23, at 10 a.m., in room 3302, New Senate Office Building, on Senate bill 1676 and related bills, to coordinate birth-control information, available upon request. Appearing as witnesses will be the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], Dr. Frederick Seitz, president of the National Academy of Sciences, Representative JOHN CONYERS, Jr., of Michigan, Representative JAMES H. SCHEUER, of New York, Robert C. Cook, President of the Population Reference Bureau, and others.

EXHIBIT 1

TEXT OF WRITTEN STATEMENT BY FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, CONCERNING THE NEED TO SOLVE THE POPULATION EXPLOSION, SUBMITTED TO SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID EXPENDITURES
GETTYSBURG, PA.,
June 18, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am complimented by your invitation for me to comment on the many problems arising out of the extraordinary and rapid increase in the world's population. I am taking advantage of your suggestion that should it be more convenient to me to submit a written statement than to appear before you in person, this would be satisfactory to the committee.

As a first comment I must say that I am delighted that your committee is concerning itself with this subject, one that I consider constitutes one of the most, if not the most, of the critical problems facing mankind today. While it is true that there remain great areas of the world in which there are still unexploited resources for food production and of irreplaceable subsurface minerals, it is still quite clear that in spite of great technical progress in production of the necessities of life, we are scarcely keeping up, in overall production and distribution, with the requirements of burgeoning and underfed populations. Moreover, since the earth is finite in area and physical resources, it is clear that unless something is done to bring an essential equilibrium between human requirements and available supply, there is going to be in some regions, not only a series of riotous explosions but a

lowering of standards of all peoples, including our own.

Ten years ago, although aware of some of these growing dangers abroad, I did not then believe it to be the function of the Federal Government to interfere in the social structures of other nations by using, except through private institutions, American resources to assist them in a partial stabilization of their numbers. I expressed this view publicly but soon abandoned it. After watching and studying results of some of the aid programs of the early fifties, I became convinced that without parallel programs looking to population stabilization all that we could do, at the very best, would be to maintain rather than improve standards in those who need our help.

We now know that the problem is not only one for foreign nations to study and to act accordingly, but it has also serious portents for us.

I realize that in important segments of our people and of other nations this question is regarded as a moral one and therefore scarcely a fit subject for Federal legislation. With their feelings I can and do sympathize. But I cannot help believe that the prevention of human degradation and starvation is likewise a moral—as well as a material—obligation resting upon every enlightened government. If we now ignore the plight of those unborn generations which, because of our unreadiness to take corrective action in controlling population growth, will be denied any expectations beyond abject poverty and suffering, then history will rightly condemn us.

I have two specific suggestions respecting S. 1676. First, I doubt the wisdom of authorizing two new Assistant Secretaries and the establishment of new bureaucratic groupings, but if this is the only way to handle the administrative activities so created I could not seriously object.

Second, I must refer to reported instances, by no means exceptional, of the repetitive production of children by unwed mothers, apparently lured by the resulting increase in income from welfare funds. To err is human and certainly none of us would want to deny needed support for anyone who because of some emotional pressure gave birth to an illegitimate child. But, when this is repeated to the point of habit, society will find itself in the curious position of spending money with one hand to slow up population growth among responsible families and with the other providing financial incentive for increased production by the ignorant, feeble-minded, or lazy. Corrective action will require careful study, for even if research should uncover no effective measures other than legal sterilization, a final resort to this method unquestionably would shock great segments of our citizenry.

I would not endanger the passage of your bill by any mention of this subject, but I submit that we have a situation here that unless corrected could become far more serious than it is today.

Along with former President Truman I am cochairman of the Honorary Sponsors Committee, Planned Parenthood—World Population. I accepted this position in order to demonstrate my recognition of the urgency of the entire problem and the alarming consequences that are certain to follow its neglect.

Being sure that other witnesses, far more competent than I in specialized and professional fields, will discuss this matter in detail before your committee, I content myself merely by saying that I devoutly hope that necessary measures will be enacted into law to authorize the Federal Government, as well as appropriate private and semipublic organizations, so to cooperate among themselves that the necessary human and material resources can be promptly mobilized and

June 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

being built through Mickey's establishment of the Meridian Community Center jointly with James Chaney and its growing role in the lives of more and more of the Negro people of Meridian. That center became a place where people could congregate, could learn the basics of citizenship and a good deal more. With sewing machines and materials sent down to the center, they were able to make for themselves a few articles of new clothing—made by and for people who had never worn anything but hand-me-downs from the homes in which many of the women work as domestics. In addition to the organizational support of the Council of Federated Organization (COFO), my wife and I, together with a host of friends, were of some small help in supplying materials, machines, stationery, books, and many other items so sorely needed for education and self-help. Mickey's example could not be tolerated; he had to be stopped.

What the conspirators and their mentors overlooked, however, was the fact that the American people had at least part of a conscience. That part was aroused by the fact that two whites albeit young Jews from New York, were brutally murdered. As a result, the movement got a national impetus which no previous event had engendered. But what about James Chaney, who, for 5 months, helped build the center, went into outlying areas with Mickey to establish freedom schools, who became more a brother to Mickey than a coworker?

Let me answer that question with another: What about Herbert Lee? I am ashamed, as an American, that I had not known the name until August 1964. Lee was a Negro farmer in Amite County, Miss., who was murdered September 25, 1961, because he had attempted to assert his right to vote as an American citizen. There was hardly a ripple of American conscience stirred by Mr. Lee's death, or by the hundreds of clandestine murders, disappearances and beatings of Negroes in the Deep South. And I am convinced that if James Chaney had been murdered alone, there would have been no comparable awakening of white Americans.

I think of a few more names. We all know of the Reverend James Reeb and Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, both murdered in Alabama in March 1965. I think it was right for public figures and people from all over the Nation to express their grief and their indignation. But where were those expressions of grief and indignation a short time before when a young American was shot to death by an Alabama State trooper for putting his body between his mother and the club of that officer? Where were the dignitaries representing Federal, State, municipal, trade union, church, fraternal and other organizations at his funeral? Jimmy Lee Jackson was black.

The vast majority of us whites has not, to this day, accepted the fact that every human being is as much an American—as is as much entitled to respect as a person—as we who are white.

During these months we have received much solace from intimates, from acquaintances and from strangers. People from all walks of life and from all over the world have expressed their sympathy. Many have also made kind comments about the courage of the three families involved—most justified, in my opinion, in the case of Mrs. Fanny Chaney and her children. But for me, one of the most moving experiences occurred last August while my wife and I were at the Atlantic City National Convention of the Democratic Party. It was during the historic attempt by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP) to have its delegates seated in place of those "elected" at primaries in Mississippi from which Negroes were systematically excluded.

BEYOND SYMPATHY

A white-haired Negro, pulling himself tall and erect, approached us, clasped our hands,

and said simply, "I am a delegate of MFDP from Lauderdale County. I would not be here if Mickey had not come to see me." We were very much touched by this living indication of the effectiveness of our son's work. But beyond that, I was impressed by this gentleman's words for another reason. I was aware of the courage it must have taken for this citizen, oppressed for his more than 60 years of life, even to have permitted Mickey to talk to him. Thereafter, I knew, he must have attended local MFDP meetings, must have gone to a county convention, the State convention and now to the national convention. All this he must have done with the knowledge that on his return home, he and his family might well meet with both physical violence and economic reprisal—loss of job, curtailment of credit, a thousand things. To me, such courage has transcended all others because it is typical of many thousands of Negroes who walk in constant fear.

More and more, I have pondered the question of how to move large numbers of our people beyond expressions of sympathy and admiration. It is heartwarming to realize that so much of America has identified itself with those of us who have become closely involved in the struggle for freedom of all of our citizens. But how far does this identification go?

I have often wondered what would happen if, by State laws and by oppression, violence and intimidation, all citizens of Irish or Italian extraction in New York State were denied the right to vote, or if, by similar means, all persons of Scandinavian or Teutonic ancestry in Minnesota were denied the right to vote. What an uproar there would be from every corner of the land. And yet, that is exactly what is happening in Mississippi, in Alabama and elsewhere. Isn't it time we adopted one standard for all Americans?

I certainly hope, as I write, that all the measures President Johnson has advanced for securing Negroes' right to vote will be implemented rapidly. But I have become convinced that legislation, carefully as it may be drawn, is subject to the tortuous delays of long, drawn-out litigation. Those people who are in absolute control of the political machinery in a given area have always been capable of frustrating the will of the majority of our citizenry for indefinite periods. This has been so, historically, in the South, until now, and there is little reason to doubt that it will continue to be so unless a means of shaking that control is found.

There is a means, however, whereby that control can be partly shaken in the next brief period. That is the situation, soon to come before the U.S. House of Representatives, in which the voices of all of us can be heard with immediate effect. It is a situation which can go far to undermine the political power illegally assumed by the dominant people in the Deep South. It is one upon which can be based major changes in the social and economic suppression of hundreds of thousands of American citizens. I refer to the challenge to unseat the five men purported to have been elected to the House from Mississippi.

THE CHALLENGE

I have been told that the challenge is supported by about 600 depositions which clearly indicate denial of the right to vote to great numbers of people. Every bit of testimony was subject to the right of cross-examination by attorneys for the challenged five men, and many of the witnesses were cross-examined. Yet the five so challenged have failed to adduce a single item of testimony on their own behalfs to rebut the evidence of the illegality of their election.

I cannot understand how we can face the world or face ourselves if we permit people elected without even the semblance of democratic process to sit in our Congress. Their voices affect not only the affairs of Missis-

issippi, but every facet of national and international life in which our Federal Government plays a role. They are our Representatives, not merely those of Mississippi. I urge every American to press upon his own Representative the duty to unseat the five challenged Mississippians.

During the year, many people, many organizations, have created awards in the names of the three young men murdered in Mississippi. Little would be more fitting to memorialize their sacrifice, in my opinion, than for Congress to insist that all of its Members be elected by an electorate fully and freely composed of all citizens from any congressional district.

Many of us have long felt that our individual voices are too puny to have an effect upon our communities, our Congressmen, upon any situation. But the enemies of an integrated America, although in a small minority, are outspoken both as individuals and in groups. We, who truly believe that all men are created equal, must make our support most clear in our daily lives, by our financial assistance, and, yes, by our political support. Each of us must help do the job of all of us.

Aiding Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, if President Johnson intends to authorize any more food for Egypt, the American people deserve a clear explanation of how it could possibly serve the national interest. Reports out of Egypt indicate that the President is planning to release \$37 million of surplus commodities. The administration will not deny it. It is my opinion that any decision to release this food should take note of the wishes of Congress. An editorial, that follows, from the Chicago Tribune of June 18, 1965, indicates that any further aid to Egypt will help our enemies:

AIDING OUR ENEMIES

Reports persist in Cairo that President Johnson is about to authorize release of \$37.5 million worth of surplus food to the United Arab Republic. This is the shipment, designated under the current 3-year aid program, which Congress blocked last February after an Egyptian mob burned the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library and a truculent President Nasser told this country to go drink seawater—slang for "go to hell." Our State Department, however, continues to deny that any decision to release the food has been made.

Nasser not only wants the food he thinks is coming to him under the current aid program which expires at the end of this month, but he also would like a new 3-year program to provide \$500 million worth of food. That would raise the cost of American food aid to the United Arab Republic to well over \$1.5 billion since 1954.

Now comes a new report from informed Cairo sources that the United Arab Republic has violated its aid agreement by diverting 40 percent of its rice crop from its own food-short population and selling it abroad. More than half of the rice exports are reported to have gone to Communist nations, including Red China and Cuba. Thus, while the United Arab Republic was accepting American food aid, which amounted to \$175

A3248

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 22, 1965

million last year, it was selling a large share of its own food to two Communist countries against which the United States has trade embargoes.

Incredible as it may seem, our aid agreement with Nasser permits him to sell to these two countries, among others, but he pledged himself to restrict exports in any 1 year to no more than about 32.5 percent of the total rice crop.

After Congress balked last February, it relented to the extent of authorizing Mr. Johnson to resume food shipments to the United Arab Republic if he found they were "in the national interest." It is hardly necessary to point out that the United States is trapped in an increasingly hot war in Vietnam, in which Red China has an influential hand. We are up to our necks trying to prevent a Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic where the Red followers of Fidel Castro play a prominent role.

By shipping food to Nasser the United States has been giving aid and comfort to two of our most implacable enemies, Red China and Cuba. If President Johnson intends to authorize any more food for the United Arab Republic, the American people deserve a clear explanation of how it could possibly serve the national interest.

VN

FE Rumsfeld

Our Guy in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco News Call-Bulletin of June 10, 1965, carried an interesting story by Guy Wright of Capt. James D. Strachan, who, I am proud to say, is a valued constituent serving his country with honor in Vietnam. This is a moving account of Captain Strachan's experiences and talents, and in these days of teach-ins I particularly commend it to my colleagues:

OUR GUY IN VIETNAM—THE UGLY-WAR AMERICAN OF GOOD WILL
(By Guy Wright)

QUANG NGAI.—At dusk Capt. James D. Strachan and I left by helicopter to bring back the bodies.

Jim took along his rope.

"I'll loop it around a leg and drag them first," he said, "in case they've been booby-trapped."

An infinite sadness came over his young face. "I had to do the same thing when I brought back O'Sullivan," he added.

Bringing back bodies isn't his real job. He's an infantry adviser and one of the best. He brings back bodies because they ask him and someone has to do it, but I wished they'd ask someone else to bring back these particular bodies.

They were Vietnamese and he would take it harder than most Americans because to him the Vietnamese are very real people.

Captain Strachan speaks Vietnamese. How he happened to learn it is interesting and offers an insight into the man.

Only 26, Jim Strachan has been a captain for 2 years. He gives Chicago as his hometown but he's a professional soldier, a West Pointer, and his real home is the Army.

He has lived in many places.

In Thailand, one day, he stopped to help a child who had been hit by a bus. The next morning a Buddhist monk in saffron

robes appeared at the American compound and sought him out.

"He said he'd seen what I did and wanted to repay me by teaching me Thai," Jim explained. "He drilled me like a Prussian drill-master. Before long I was speaking pretty good Thai."

With that basis of a kindred language, Jim took a spare-time course in Vietnamese and later underwent intensive training at the Monterey Language School.

"So I had a little headstart when I came here," he said.

The truth is that he speaks fluent Vietnamese. More than that, he has an instinctive compassion and understanding for these people.

Other Americans lump them all together as good or bad. Jim Strachan never does that. He sees them as individuals and even the individuals as men with both strengths and weaknesses.

When everyone was down on a dai uy (captain) who had blundered, Jim said quietly, "He's done a good job but this time he made a mistake."

His face was sad when he said it. In fact he looks sad most of the time. I think he sees things other men miss.

I wanted to ask him about that but I didn't because he isn't a person who tells you his life story the first time he meets you.

I wish more American advisers could speak Vietnamese. From watching Jim work I'm convinced it would help immeasurably.

Another adviser was having differences with his Vietnamese counterpart in planning a patrol. It turned into a pidgin English row.

Jim went over and talked with the Vietnamese officer in his own language and soon things were straightened out.

Another time two Vietnamese soldiers started taking down our shade tent in the middle of an operation, leaving us in the broiling sun. They were about to get lynched until Jim intervened.

He learned that the tent had been borrowed from the Vietnamese after a helicopter blew down our own. Now they needed it back. But as a favor to Jim, they agreed to put ours up for us again.

In the course of the day he comforted a widow who came to watch a plane take her husband away in his coffin.

He handled the intelligence debriefing of a Vietnamese pilot, helped a stranded Vietnamese photographer, and did many other things, all the while performing his regular work.

Now, at dusk, a Vietnamese major had learned that two of his soldiers lay dead on a river bank. Naturally, he brought his problem to Captain Strachan.

Going for bodies at dusk is risky business. The Vietcong use the dead as decoys for ambushes. But Jim couldn't refuse this man because they spoke the same language, in more ways than one.

So he coiled his rope and the 'copter took off. We swooped over the sandy river bank where the bodies were supposed to be, then upstream and down.

We made several passes but they clearly weren't there.

"Fishing boats were working along here today," Jim said. "A fisherman must have found them."

I'm ashamed of myself, but I was glad that we didn't find the bodies. I'd seen and smelled enough death for one day.

Jim gave the pilot the go home sign with his thumb and the 'copter wheeled toward its pad.

Once again Jim's knowledge of the language proved valuable. If some other American had returned without the bodies, the Vietnamese major would have suspected he didn't really look.

But when Jim said they weren't there the man accepted his word.

His mission finished, the young captain dropped the coiled rope with utter distaste. "Let's go to dinner," he said and smiled. But even his smile was sad.

National Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I include an editorial appearing in the June 10, 1965, issue of the Catholic Standard of Washington, D.C., entitled "National Course," highly commending the leadership and courage of President Johnson in the field of foreign affairs.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Catholic Standard, June 10, 1965]

NATIONAL COURSE

The recent speeches of the President on our foreign policy should have a beneficial and cumulative effect on all, especially our critics at home. He has been spelling out, repeatedly, the precise purpose of our actions in a manner that cannot fail eventually to convince the world.

The President's speech at Catholic University appropriately emphasized our moral commitment to mankind, "For America's only interests in the world today are those we regard as inseparable from our moral duties to mankind. This is the truth, the abiding truth about America. Yet all through this century, men in other lands have—for reasons of their own—elected to discount moral duty as the motivation that moves America."

The actions of the United States in Vietnam and in Santo Domingo give substance to the words of the President. Despite the caterwauling against our action in those countries by some critics, the events have dramatically demonstrated that such action was indispensable.

The critics of our continuing action in South Vietnam, especially the intellectuals, become tongue-tied about the constant atrocities of the Vietcong; the murder of 700 civilians in 4 months of this year, the kidnapping of more than 3,000 civilians, of whom about 300 were Government officials, as well as the massive invasion of the whole country by the Vietcong forces. In the other disturbed area, Santo Domingo, and our Armed Forces are being withdrawn as Latin American forces are sent in—which proves the continuing need for peacekeeping forces.

Fortunately, the President has indicated that he will not be deterred from following the course he has charted. In stating his goal, he used the words of Pope John XXIII, "There is an immense task incumbent on all men of good will, namely, the task of restoring the relations of the human family in truth, in justice, in love, and in freedom."

JUSTICE IN LOUISIANA

The cause of justice in the South, particularly in Louisiana, is once again on trial. The occasion for the trial is the murder of a Negro deputy sheriff of Bogalusa. Evidence indicates that the murder may have been a carefully planned ambush. It is time that the South show by a fair trial that a spirit of justice exists.

This latest murder and other murders connected with integration highlight the obliga-

June Pelly 65
 The College Teach-in on Vietnam

been doing a wonderful job educating the youth of our town for a long time.

"An opportunity for religious education is given to the youth of our town. Each church sponsors a religious training plan. Our citizens recognize dependence on God and we like to worship God. Witness the variety of churches and a synagogue here. They testify to a fundamental American right of each of us to worship in freedom. The released time hour for religious training enjoyed by the public school children each week educates each generation of youth to a better knowledge and dependence on our Creator and I know our community is better because of this part of our education to complete our formation for citizenship. The approach to education in our town is good and healthy and it has proven to be a source of tremendous and unusual strength and vigor. Of course, I don't think Clinton is a Shangri-la as the expression goes but it is a wonderful town where people can come and build a life that balances the common good in a happy harmony.

"I like our town and the longer I live here the more I realize why thousands of other people, natives, and others not born here, like the community and ever speak well of it. Somehow, I feel it is rather typical of American towns, large or small. Indeed it is a typical American town.

"Because I think it is good I am happy to take this opportunity granted to me by the kindness of the Clinton High School officials, to tell you—the 1965 graduates of this high school—what I have found here.

"This is America. Every culture, every race, every interest, every background, thriving in a free world, contributing to the common good, producing a way of life and a strength which is completely different than the world has ever known. We do not survive by denying what we believe or what we hope for or what we aspire to; we do not survive by asking others to surrender their differences. Americans are dedicated to the principle of diversity and unity. We cannot demand, we must not demand, that everyone be the same, think the same way, believe the same things, accept the same ideas.

"Rather, within the bountiful freedom of these shores, with clear recognition of our obligations, we must continue to develop a unity which allows and encourages differences and draws from all the best for the common good. America then is a mosaic with meaning. It is people joined together in a common cause without surrendering personal desires, ambitions and goals, national or religious differences.

"Our present educational system has emerged from the unique form of government which our forefathers fashioned. On the basis of this was built a Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the idea that all men were created equal. They pledged liberty and justice for all. Our education is an expression of this and we should treasure this gift.

"And this I believe is America. I venture to say that we see America at its very best where we find a society progressive, competitive, free and dynamic. Our founding fathers, our teachers, our clergymen, our civic leaders, with our parents have tried to form such a community.

"If you by now have received the impression that I think our town is a perfect community, then you have received the wrong impression. However, it is a good American community. Here people are living together and working together and achieving a sort of unity which yields strength and vigor. We are trying to recognize the differences that are so essential in American life. We are all trying to do our best to make our little piece of America everything it should be without tramping on anyone, without denying anyone his basic

rights, without any intention of weakening what we understand to be democracy—a free people living together, respecting one another, accepting one another as they exercise their rights and freedoms, respecting our sacred national heritage and trying to achieve a unity that stands in sharp contrast to a uniformity.

"Clinton High has given to you a planned schedule to succeed in life. The courses taught, some difficult, some easy according to your individual preferences and talents have developed in you the spirit of self reliance and accomplishment. You have mastered the lessons given or you would not be here today.

"Your family life also aided in your education. The living examples of your parents, hard working, industrious, have affected your actions, your speech and your dress. In fact, your whole character, inwardly and outwardly, is but a mirror of your family life. Never forget it and be ever grateful to those loved ones, be they parents or guardians, or grown up sisters and brothers, who were kind and good to you.

"You live in a free society where obedience to law is liberty, but that obedience has not been difficult or constricting. Freedom to play, to work, to pray, to dream, to plan for a future is part of our educational background. Today, as never before, must we remember that freedom and we should ever thank God that our childhood is not a bitter memory of oppression, slave labor, spying on one another and the regimentation of mind as well as of body.

"I mention these things to you because I wish you to recall where you go out into tomorrow that you have been given every help, religious, educational and material to follow whatever path in life God will open to your choice. Strength of soul, strength of mind, and strength of body, are yours. Use them wisely and well.

"I read an interesting story recently. It read somewhat as follows:

"When I was young I wanted everything and all at once, until a clergyman explained things this way. One night he had a dream. There was a new store in the community he lived in. He went in and saw an angel behind the counter. 'What does your store sell?' 'Everything your heart desires,' the angel answered. Then I want 'peace on earth, an end to sorrow, famine, and disease,' cried out the clergyman. 'Just a moment,' smiled the angel. 'You have not quite understood * * * we don't sell fruits here only seeds.'"

"With loving care the church, the school, and the home, has planted the seeds for your heart's desires. Nourish them with constant faith in God, trust in them to produce the career in life you will follow and rely on them to make you worthy of the proud heritage of family love given to each of you.

"All these things have been given to you in our town in 1965, graduates of Clinton High. I think it is therefore a thoroughly American town, I think it is truly an American way of life. I hope that in 2065 our town will still exist and it will be a free, strong, vigorous, dynamic community. I think it will be free if there are still the same opportunities for youth, for this will ever be a dramatic symbol of a free people, exercising free choice, educating children in a spirit of freedom and forming a free society.

"And all this will be possible if you remember with gratitude the lessons taught here and if in your life to come you put into practice the gifts of knowledge, of example, and of faith your parents, your teachers, and your friends gave to you.

"May God who holds us in the palm of His hand guide and keep you in my prayer for you always."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, recently, an article by Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J., director of forensics, Gonzaga University, was mailed to me by one of my friends. It deals with the war in Vietnam and with statements of members of our so-called intellectual communities which no doubt are very useful to propagandists in Hanoi and Peking.

I am sure my colleagues will find this short article interesting and, therefore, I have obtained leave to have it printed herewith in the Appendix of the Record:

More than 50 of the Nation's colleges have been playing a rather deadly role in regard to Vietnam. We can expect more activity from them now that we are winning. As long as we were losing they did not seem to mind. There were no demonstrations during all the years that North Vietnam was succeeding in its savage efforts to conquer the South. There were no campus protests or student marches when our Embassy was bombed and 121 civilians were injured, or when American families were grenaded in their apartments. The colleges protested only when we arrested the impending defeat by carrying the war to the North.

My first experience with the leftwing reaction to our escalation of the war was not long in coming. Some non-Catholic students phoned from Berkeley that the left were staging mass protest demonstrations against the action we were finally taking against North Vietnam. They wanted to know if I would debate "anyone the leftwing could put up." I agreed, and soon found myself on the Berkeley campus, 900 miles away. My opponent turned out to be Professor Scott, a doctor of political science. Hundreds of students stood for 1½ hours on the campus plaza to hear the debate. The professor argued that the war in Vietnam was entirely indigenous to the South. He said that Dien had been "dug up out of a monastery," that the United States was the aggressor, and that we should get out. A question period followed, and the students bought 800 copies of the booklet I had written on Vietnam. A resolution calling for our withdrawal from Vietnam was introduced into the student council a few weeks later. A Jewish student named Danny Rosenthal wrote to let me know that they had been able to use the arguments in the pamphlet effectively, and that the resolution was defeated. He reported that the council vote was "9 to 9. Whew."

Later in the spring I debated professors at San Francisco State College and elsewhere. The arguments I encountered invariably undermined the U.S. position, but never criticized the Communists. The reasons given were similar to those I heard when I debated at Eastern Washington State College in May, the difference being that I was debating there against James Jackson, the Communist editor of the Worker.

What depresses our servicemen most in Vietnam is the scuttle-and-run movements led by our intellectual communities here at home. The real danger America faces is not in southeast Asia, but in our own centers of learning. They have blissfully abandoned the basic principles of Christianity on which

June 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3265

well, then—even in atomic attack—millions of Massachusetts people will be alive afterwards.

Huge geographical areas of our State could escape almost without a scratch. A badly shattered industrial system could be put back into business. Adequate preparedness can blunt the blow and hasten recovery.

That's our job. Yours and mine.

On the other hand, one of the most disturbing aspects of the situation is that the spectre of atomic debacle appears so stupendous that the public too often shrinks from facing the awful truth. So do some of our fellow businessmen.

Others assume that the consequences are so terrible that no ruler will press the button. That's living in a fool's paradise. They forget recent unbelievable events. A few years back no one could imagine a beloved President shot down in cold blood. But he was. No one could dream that in modern civilization anyone would doom millions of helpless prisoners to murder ovens. Yet Hitler did.

Others assume that once calamity is on the wing nothing can be done for escape or recovery. Their senses are dulled into fatalistic attitude of absolutely unenecessary hopelessness—and they do nothing.

I warn you: The most deadly gesture of our atom-haunted times is not the shudder of fear but the shrug of indifference.

History is filled with tragedies caused by indifference and ignorance and unbelief and neglect. These gaps resulted in dearth of safeguards and lack of preparedness. All of these disasters might have been prevented by adequate foresight and resolute forearming.

Because proper safety measures were not taken, 1,500 were drowned on the Titanic and close to 500 were burned to death in Boston's Coconut Grove fire.

Along the American frontier, Indians massacred settlers who neglected to build and man blockhouses. The Dutch, Danes, and Norwegians escaped World War I. Thereafter they lived in false hope that they would be forever free. They ignored building adequate defenses. Then Hitler struck "like a thief in the night"—slaughtering those unready neutrals.

Failure to recognize danger brought disaster. But almost every catastrophe can be diverted or lessened by adequate preparedness—and so can nuclear attack. I repeat, so can nuclear attack.

Your State government must try to organize for any emergency. With your help we shall. We must plan as best we can even though we cannot foresee the future with pinpoint accuracy. Every war is different from the last. Each had unique surprises that military intelligence failed to discover.

Unexpectedly the Kaiser's huge guns quickly pulverized the stout Belgian forts. Nazi V-2 rockets penetrated Britain's defense system. The "day of infamy" struck Pearl Harbor.

Yes, task groups and civil defense personnel plan for postnuclear attack. But all of us associated with government must be ready for any other sneak punch. We must be on our toes for any gigantic force of nature on the rampage.

Who knows? Maybe accident or sabotage will trigger explosion. Maybe death-dealing missiles will reach their targets through outer space. Maybe eventually the bomb and its far-reaching fallout might be unleashed—not by Moscow but by Peiping. Maybe that bomb might be delivered by a Red Chinese ship off Boston Harbor.

Maybe terrible tornado, flood, earthquake, drought, fire, explosion, or other peacetime disaster might hit our State a staggering blow.

We must not be caught napping. We must prepare for all contingencies. We are trying to do that now at the State level—through all sorts of group studies, disaster drills, and realistic demonstrations at our

Civil Defense Agency headquarters in Framingham and our training academy in Topsfield. Other State agencies also are cooperating in emergency preparedness.

Your conference today on the management of resources is a very important part of that continuous alert. For it will further develop advice which you will give me on plans to regulate in war emergency the distribution and use of Massachusetts resources. Without such—confusion and chaos. With such—rescue and recovery.

In conclusion, let me hold up to you this ideal, expressed by the late Prof. Alfred North Whitehead of Harvard University.

"A great society," declared this famous teacher, "is a society in which its men of business think greatly of their functions."

Members of the task groups, that description fits you.

There is no greater business function today than to save Massachusetts from nuclear doom. There is no finer business service than to strengthen peace by increasing economic might.

For your leadership in these grand missions and in behalf of a grateful Commonwealth, I proudly award your commissions.

Fine Address by Monsignor John J. Gannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record and include therein an article from the Clinton Daily Item setting forth a brilliant address at the recent high school baccalaureate exercises of the distinguished spiritual leader and Pastor of St. John's Church, Clinton, Mass., the Right Reverend Monsignor John J. Gannon, P.A., V.G.

I think this address by Monsignor Gannon is one of the very best of its kind I have ever read.

It is on a lofty, spiritual plane, and yet it is down to earth, eloquent, brilliantly conceived, and inspirational to a very rare degree.

The great talents of Monsignor Gannon, and his deep understanding of people, and his sensitive response to human problems and needs, as well as his friendliness, neighborliness, and good works have won for him the high esteem and deep affection, respect, and admiration of the Clinton community and of everyone who knows of him in every part of our State and Nation.

This is a fine address that I can commend to all:

[From the Clinton Item, June 7, 1965]

MONSIGNOR GANNON IS SPEAKER AT CHS
BACCALAUREATE

The Right Reverend Monsignor John F. Gannon, P.A.V.G., pastor of St. John's Church, spoke of Clinton, its history, the dedication of its founders and their contribution to the United States as he addressed the 185 graduates of Clinton High School yesterday afternoon.

The occasion marked the annual baccalaureate exercises opening the commencement week activities.

The program was held at 3 at the school auditorium.

The students attired in their caps and gowns and led by the class officers marched into the hall for the traditional program.

The musical program in conjunction with the event was directed by Charles H. Young, music supervisor, Miss Merina Healey and James P. Pender, members of the class, were soloists.

The text of Monsignor Gannon's address follows:

"I like our town. I think it is a beautiful town. It nestles in a valley outlined by a big dam, built by men, to supply a precious commodity, water, to a great city, Boston, the largest city in our State, where the capital of Massachusetts is located.

"There is a lot of history in our town. It is a small America because the founders of our town and all who took up residence here contributed in many ways to make the United States the great country that is today, a model for the whole world. In industry first the carpet mills and today our electronics, bookbinding, furniture, wire, plastics, and other industries make industrial America aware of Clinton. In statesmanship our town has in the past and continues today to contribute respected citizens to leadership in State government, congressional government, and, indeed, one of our native sons became a Governor of this State and later served with distinction for many years in the Senate of the United States. The fields of education, of medicine, and of religion and science and law have been and are graced today by citizens of our town who contributed much to the common good of these professions. I could continue to mention those who left our town to make America great in the various professions and callings, and vocations, our country offers, but time will not permit me.

"But I like my town most of all because of the people who live here. A town is not rivers, roads, bridges, dams, and buildings, a town is people and I suppose I am prejudiced but I think people are just wonderful. They are good people and they have worked hard to make our community a wonderful place to live. They work together on all sorts of projects of common concern. We have our differences, of course, but we manage to settle them in a friendly fashion because we are always able to sit down and talk out our problems. We have the old-fashioned town government here. We do not always agree but we manage to arrive at some answer that is generally accepted in the common interest.

"Our town is very cosmopolitan. People who come from different parts of the world live here. These good people came to our town and established their homes. Many of them settled in a particular section of the town in the early days. One could make a map identifying, section by section, the people by their custom and their language. But great as were these differences, and they still exist, these people learned to live together, to respect one another and to help one another. They formed a good town and I am proud that it is my town.

"I like my town because I think it has done and is doing a fine job for children. There are parks, playgrounds and various youth programs sponsored by the community and by the churches. There are problems of course but all in all the children are rather good. There is a fine school program here. Public and parochial schools educate our children.

"At the elementary level about half the children attend parochial schools. If the parents wish they may send their children to one of the religious or nonreligious private schools or they may send their child to a public or parochial school. One finds here all good schools and I think they have

our country was founded, and without which our democracy cannot survive. FBI Director Hoover has warned that the Communists are striving to initiate other marches and demonstrations "to keep their campaign of fear and terror rolling." But Hoover is old hat to the pseudointellectuals. They consider him passe. Colleges used to be our main source of patriotic leadership, but if the teach-ins are any indication, they are mainly a source for saboteurs. The newspapers in Hanoi and Peking are full of reports about the dissention in this country over Vietnam, and nothing is giving so much solace to our enemy as the remarks of our professors.

When I spoke at the University of Oregon, for example, I heard the following arguments. Said Professor Bail: "Our position in Vietnam is hypocritical. We are moving in the same direction Hitler did." Declared Professor Aberle: "I am against domination of any country and I am opposed to capitalist imperialism, which is the worst." Stated Professor Edwards: "Our foreign policy is absolute self-delusion." Said Professor Boulding, who had come from the University of Michigan to lend his scholarly support: "The United States is a bandit. We have no legitimacy. Red China is much less committed to conquering the world than we are. The monolithic concept of communism as a world force is a paranoid concept of the John Birch Society."

At the teach-in in Washington, D.C., the University of Chicago's Hans Morgenthau made a slashing attack on U.S. policy. His solution was brilliant: "Let Ho Chi Minh win." Briarcliff's Professor Millet said that "terror on our side accounts for all that has happened in Vietnam." Even Harvard's Arthur Schlesinger, who was supposed to be defending the administration's position, said that we should never have gone to the aid of Vietnam, indicating that we do not even know what freedom is. With Schlesinger on our side, we really did not need anyone against us.

My experience in debating against left-wing professors has taught me that they are impossible to convince, but are easy to refute. Don Clark, a junior at the University of Oregon, recently refuted them very well in a letter that appeared in the student newspaper on May 11.

"Professors: Why is it, gentlemen, that in class many of you repeatedly emphasize that truth is wholly relative, that ethical values have no inherent worth, that the concept of right and wrong is a prescientific myth, yet now you vigorously denounce the 'immorality' of America's commitment in Vietnam?"

"Especially you gentlemen of the political science department who continually stress that there is no scientific basis for an 'ought to' argument, how can you now affirm that we 'ought to' withdraw from southeast Asia? Why this sudden preoccupation with ethical abstractions? If moral precepts are ultimately meaningless for individual conduct, why should they restrict our national affairs? Or is there, after all, a higher Truth to which both men and nations should submit? If so, why aren't we informed about it in class (or has the Supreme Court ruled against that too)?"

"Suddenly our professors have become moral prophets, calling the Johnson administration to repentance and damning all who oppose them with hell, fire, and nuclear holocaust. Really now, which one is the phony: the concept of morality or the professor who does not believe in morality and yet appeals to it in order to win public sympathy and support?"

"Or maybe this is just one more example of the utter bankruptcy of modern liberalism. Perhaps, as Whitaker Chambers believed, the liberal professor has no answers for the diseases of our age, but is himself a symptom of its sickness."

Commissioner George H. Hearn Addresses the Group Travel Executives Association Regarding the Expansion of Ocean Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month Federal Maritime Commissioner George H. Hearn delivered a very timely address before the Group Travel Executives Association in New York.

Although the Commission's interests are involved primarily in cargo operations, the views of Commissioner Hearn will be of such interest to everyone concerned with ocean travel and passenger service that I insert the full text of his remarks below:

REMARKS OF GEORGE H. HEARN OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION BEFORE THE GROUP TRAVEL EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION, AT NEW YORK CITY ON JUNE 3, 1965

Gentlemen, I was pleased to receive your kind invitation to join you here today. At the outset I should explain that I appear here as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission, that our mandate from the Congress is encompassed in the Shipping Acts, and that our business is peculiarly cargo oriented rather than passenger weighted. Although the thrust of our energy and expertise involves cargo operations primarily, I must say that we are not without concern or responsibility in the passenger field.

First, I think I should explain the nature of the Commission, its composition, and its work. I will then attempt to explain our passenger undertakings and to comment, as an American citizen, upon the present posture of cruise operations in this country.

The Federal Maritime Commission was established in 1961 pursuant to reorganization plan No. 7 of that year. We inherited from the old Federal Maritime Board the regulatory functions set out in the Shipping Act of 1916 and in the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933. The promotional responsibilities of the old Federal Maritime Board which concerns the development and maintenance of a strong American merchant marine, now reside in the Maritime Administration which is an entity within the Department of Commerce. The Federal Maritime Commission, as an independent regulatory agency, is not at all connected with either the Maritime Administration or the Department of Commerce. Under the 1933 act, our Commission exercises rather extensive regulatory authority over common carriers by water plying our offshore domestic trades, primarily between the continental United States on the one hand and Puerto Rico, Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam on the other hand. Our authority is not unlike that exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission over common carriers here in the United States, with one notable exception: the Federal Maritime Commission does not issue certificates of convenience and necessity. Any American citizen is at liberty to enter or leave our domestic trades at will. As to the level of rates and fares charged in our domestic trades, however, the Commission has authority to investigate the reasonableness of the rates and fares and upon a finding that such rates and fares are unjust or unreasonable, it has the authority to prescribe and order enforced reasonable maximum or

minimum, or maximum and minimum rates and fares. In our foreign commerce our rate authority stems from the Shipping Act of 1916, and is substantially less than that granted to us by the Intercoastal Shipping Act.

By reason of an amendment to the Shipping Act, passed in 1961, the Commission has authority to disapprove, after hearing, any rate or charge observed by a common carrier in our foreign trades which is so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States. The thrust of the 1916 act, as I see it, is contained in section 15, whereby persons subject to our jurisdiction can band together and set rates and conditions of carriage in concert, provided such schemes have the prior approval of the Commission. Approval under that section renders such agreements immune from the provisions of the antitrust laws. A weighty responsibility is thus cast upon the Commission by this section. In my view, this exception to our national antitrust policy is warranted only where the grant contributes to the public interest of the United States. Consequently, we at the Commission must maintain continuing surveillance over approved agreements to insure that their continued operation is not inimical to our public interest or detrimental to our commerce.

In addition to the common carriers by water, under the Shipping Act we have regulatory responsibility over freight forwarders and terminal operators who offer their services in connection with common carriers by water.

I hope that my previous remarks have given you some broad insight into the Commission and its responsibilities. I know, of course, that you are more concerned with passenger travel and particularly with the authority of the Commission as regards passenger travel. So, to that end, I would now like to address myself. Until 1959, when the old Federal Maritime Board instituted docket No. 873, an "Investigation of Passenger Steamship Conferences Regarding Travel Agents," strange as it may seem, only one case concerning passengers was reported by our predecessor agencies: Passenger Classifications and Fares, American Line Steamship Corp., and was in 1934. Oddly that case involved domestic or intercoastal fares. I say oddly because only an infinitesimal share of ocean passenger travel involves our domestic trades. Apart from its historical interest, however, that particular case offers no meaningful precedent in today's world. But in 1959 the old Board took a broad look at international passenger travel in the aforementioned proceeding.

I need not remind you gentlemen that the lion's share of intercontinental passenger and cruise business emanates from New York. Nor need I comment, as a private citizen, that an overwhelming amount of this business leaves our shores on vessels which do not fly the American flag, and consequently, which do not employ American citizen seamen. But I will revert to this later.

In any event, our 1959 investigation, which was extremely thorough, inspected our passenger business through an examination of the Trans-Atlantic Passenger Steamship Conference and the Atlantic Passenger Steamship Conference, both approved agreements under section 15 of the Shipping Act, to determine whether they deserved the privilege of continuing their concerted operations, immune from the antitrust laws, particularly in light of their dealings with American travel agents. Our decision in that case was rendered only in February 1964, and I should note that part of our decision has been challenged by the carriers, and the matter is still pending before the courts.

The chief accomplishments of that decision, I believe, (1) prevents the passenger conferences from prohibiting freight for-

June 22, 1965

A3268

warders acting as travel agents, (2) discontinues an impediment placed on travel agents, by the conferences, against the selling of transportation by nonconference lines, the so-called "tieding rule," and (3) in the "unanimity rule" by which, among other things, an increase in agents commissions could be prevented by any one member of the conference, whether or not our trade is ever served by that member line. I fervently believe that our decision in this case should unshackle travel agents to the extent that they can substantially encourage sea travel.

Ocean cruise business, as you most certainly know, is ever on the increase. As our citizens become more and more affluent, cruises of varying durations and costs become more and more attractive. On the whole, these cruises represent a wholesome, refreshing and rather economical vacation. Last summer, however, over 300 American cruise passengers were bitterly disappointed when the *Riviera Prima* departed our shores prematurely, frustrating the entire cruise, preempting these people of their vacations, and, as a coup de grace, leaving them without meaningful resource to recover their fares. Gentlemen, cruise travel, then crossing the threshold into a most substantial market, was there given a serious back eye. A consequence, as you know, has been the introduction in this Congress of several bills to regulate cruises. Now, while it is true that the unfortunate instances represented by the *Riviera Prima* fiasco are few and far between, the disappointment and loss to the particular cruise passengers on that occasion was nevertheless very real, and I fear, in light of the burgeoning cruise business and especially its potential, symptomatic of further ills which could befall the American traveling public.

Further, and again as a private citizen rather than as an official of the Federal Maritime Commission, I take unhappy note of the fact that our cruise business is drifting more and more to foreign flag vessels. You know, our cabotage laws, as they do in other countries, notably Great Britain, restrict to American registered vessels that trade, including the transportation of passengers, which is wholly within the United States. I seriously wonder whether our cabotage laws should be extended, rather than restricted, so as to reserve for our merchant marine, and our own seamen, the operation of cruise vessels which, in fact, do not engage in the foreign commerce, but on the contrary have the same beginning and terminal point in the United States. This matter, however, is beyond my particular expertise. Nevertheless, as a citizen, mindful of our national commitment to establish and maintain a strong merchant marine, I believe that the question should be raised and the issue carefully examined.

In any event, gentlemen, while ocean travel is not growing at the rate air transport is, at least as a means of movement from place to place, there is, however, an increase in ocean travel and there will always be a demand for it. And in addition to ocean passenger travel from place to place, cruises properly operated and realistically priced, offer a market of untold size and unexploited value. The large concentration of our population in the Northeast United States represents a lucrative tomorrow for those who are willing to provide honest cruise services from our ports. Therefore, I urge you to nurture this enterprise, to develop it realistically, without gimmicks, but with straightforward presentations, designated to meet the needs and understanding of your potential market—honest working people who desire simple diversions and who could appreciate the grandeur and adventure of our ocean vacations.

NCWC Aid Backs Repeal of Right-To-Work Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in the Michigan Catholic on June 10, 1965, wherein Msgr. George G. Higgins, testifying before the House Education and Labor Committee, opposed the so-called right-to-work laws:

NCWC AID BACKS REPEAL OF RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

WASHINGTON.—The director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference's Social Action Department has endorsed the administration's proposal to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act's right-to-work section.

Msgr. George G. Higgins, testifying June 8 before the House Education and Labor Committee, said so-called right-to-work laws are politically, socially, economically and ethically unsound.

He said in his testimony, "I am speaking in the name of the social action department and not in the name of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference or in the name of the body of American bishops."

Monsignor Higgins said right-to-work laws "do not provide jobs for workers, they merely prevent workers from building strong and stable unions."

Right-to-work laws, barring labor-management agreements making union membership a condition of employment, are authorized by section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947. Nineteen States have such laws.

Monsignor Higgins said the pressure of them "does not arise from workers seeking their 'rights'."

"Proponents of these measures are uniformly employers' organization and related groups," he said. "Often such laws are part of a program by underdeveloped States seeking to attract industry by the lure of a docile and low-paid labor force."

He rejected the argument of States' rights raised in support of these laws, saying there are "strong reasons why States should not regulate labor matters where interstate commerce is involved."

"The greatness of our economy is attributable in no small measure to the absence of trade barriers and the presence of uniform conditions of commerce among the several States of the Union," he said. "Measures which would destroy this uniformity and erect barriers would be contrary to the general welfare."

Monsignor Higgins also denied that compulsory membership is "contrary to the American tradition of freedom," calling this assertion a political slogan and dangerously false.

"People who make this argument," he said, "are claiming for workers a freedom which the latter do not desire." He noted that in nearly 50,000 secret elections, workers had voted in favor of the union shop 97 percent of the time.

As for the argument that compulsory union membership contributes to "abuses of unionism, such as autocracy, dissipation

of funds, and racketeering," he acknowledged that this claim has "a basis in fact."

"But the remedy for abuses within a union is not a measure which weakens a union in its legitimate functions. . . . When a useful and proper form of activity is occasionally abused, the remedy is to attack the abuse directly, and not abolish the activity itself," he said.

The Fallacies of the Opponents of Our Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column from the New York Herald Tribune of June 21, 1965, by the distinguished journalist, Roscoe Drummond, on the fallacious reasoning of the opponents of this administration's policies in southeast Asia:

THE CRITICS—JOHNSON'S VIET POLICY AND OPPONENTS' FALLACIES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—You come back to Washington after a reporting trip abroad, and what do you find?

You find President Johnson being criticized on the political right for not carrying the war far enough and fast enough into North Vietnam.

You find the President being criticized on the political left for not getting out of the war entirely and leaving South Vietnam to its own devices.

You find, not surprisingly, that more Americans—according to the latest Gallup poll—are supporting the administration in exactly what it is doing, holding the course without any intention of giving up.

And this leaves LBJ right in the middle of the national consensus, where he is perfectly willing to be.

The nub of the Ballup poll is that, in the wake of this attack from two extremes, support for quitting has gone up 1 percent and support for holding the course has gone up 7 percent.

What is particularly striking to a returned reporter is the extent to which the American critics of our defense of South Vietnam rest their arguments on the same fallacies as do the foreign critics whom I encountered in Africa—and ignore the same facts.

If their premises are correct, then Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson either egregiously misread the facts or they really are imperialists who should be rejected by the American people. The premises:

That the attempt to impose a Communist government in South Vietnam is a civil war.

That the Vietcong is a great idealistic movement, a sort of Indochinese version of the American Populist Party.

That, even if neither of these premises is true, the South Vietnamese people do not have the will to defend themselves and, therefore, either cannot be or do not deserve to be helped.

These are the arguments which the neutralists leaders abroad love to throw at you. Evidently they are about the same arguments which dominate the critics' dialog at home.

What are the facts?

Is this truly a civil war in South Vietnam? The answer is that a majority (excepting its one Communist member) of the International Control Commission, set up by the Geneva Conference of 1954, has rendered the independent judgment that the Vietcong are armed and led by Hanoi.

Are the Vietcong "social reformers" who just want to create a better life for the South Vietnamese? Or are they hard-core aggressors intent upon imposing a totalitarian rule from North Vietnam? The answer, in the words of Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, certainly no reactionary imperialist, is that "they are very tough terrorists whose gains have come, in the main, not from the hopes they have inspired but from the fear they have created."

Are the South Vietnamese lacking in the wish and will to resist? The answer is that the Vietcong have been constantly raiding medical clinics, destroying agricultural stations, and murdering schoolteachers, village chiefs, and others who risk their lives to give South Vietnam order and social service.

Since 1954 the Vietcong have killed or kidnaped 10,000 civilian officials in South Vietnam. On the basis of comparative populations, this would be like having 130,000 American officials killed or kidnaped at home during a war.

In the face of all this, the South Vietnamese are resisting harder than ever.

The only way the critics can make their case is to ignore the facts. Most Americans are not ignoring them.

FE — ~~VN~~ Rogers
Vietnam Propaganda Lies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Palm Beach Post recently editorialized on the propaganda we have been hearing from Communist sources regarding our role in southeast Asia, and because the editorial clearly outlines the fact that many nations are cooperating to defend freedom in this area, I ask that it be printed here in the RECORD: [From the Palm Beach (Fla.) Post, May 29, 1965]

PROPAGANDA LIES

A comparative handful of Americans (small in number but large of mouth) has been very active denouncing American assistance to the South Vietnamese in their attempt to keep communism out of their country.

This noisy minority would have us believe the United States is defying the world to aid the South Vietnam people.

Actually, 30 different nations are aiding the South Vietnamese in their struggle against Communist domination. To mention only a few:

South Korea has 2,000 troops in South Vietnam.

Australia is sending an infantry battalion. The Philippines House of Representatives has voted to send 2,000 troops.

Japan has a small unit on the scene.

And many other nations, unable to send combat troops, are offering aid and support of various kinds.

So, when demonstrators, conscientious objectors, leftist faculty members or students, or other critics of America's role in the cold war complain that the United States is

"going it alone" against world opinion; remember, it's just not so.

Keep in mind, too, that many of the 30-odd nations giving aid and support to South Vietnam are Asian countries.

There are millions of people in Asia who, having seen our fair treatment of Japan following World War II and our granting of independence to the Philippines, are well aware that we do not seek to dominate Asian affairs.

Those throughout the Americas who criticize our presence in the Dominican Republic might recall that we helped Cuba gain her independence, then turned it over to the Cuban people that they might run their own affairs; that for a century and a half we kept the colonial powers of Europe out of the Americas.

Some of our own people would do well to consider the facts of history.

Men Argue, Government Does Nothing, Crops Rot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, "a tragedy—made in Washington" is aptly described in an article by Harlan Trott, which appeared in the June 17, 1965, issue of Christian Science Monitor.

There are several sides to every story. Some may be more accurate and honest than others.

The Monitor has done another excellent reportorial job. I commend this article to my colleagues and others who are seeking facts.

The full text of the Monitor article follows:

MEN ARGUE, CROPS ROT

(By Harlan Trott, staff correspondent of Christian Science Monitor)

SALINAS, CALIF.—"A tragedy—made in Washington" is the way a farm spokesman describes the plight of California's strawberry growers.

Hundred of acres of strawberries are wasting in the Salinas Valley as growers, unions, and Government men argue over the shortage of farmworkers.

"Tragedy, nothing" scoffs Tom Pitts, State AFL-CIO chief. "It's a hoax."

Governor Edmund G. Brown has told union leaders to "put up or shut up."

The Governor is convinced the growers are in real trouble. He is begging Washington to open farther the door Congress slammed on the braceros December 31, and to let in enough Mexican crews to save this year's crop.

Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz toured the Salinas Valley in March. He announced that growers were making out well enough with domestic farmworkers. Since then the picture has grown critical.

Mr. Wirtz named a fact-finding panel to assess the farm crisis. Then, on April 26, he approved the use of 2,500 Japanese and Mexican nationals to help save the strawberry and asparagus crops.

"Mr. Wirtz should see this field now," said Ben Lopez, director of the Growers Farm Labor Association here. "Would you call this a hoax? You're standing right where Mr. Wirtz stood in March when he said there were plenty of domestic workers."

The reporter's gaze swept the deserted expanse of Stolich Ranch—one of four 500-acre fields run by Salinas Strawberries, Inc.

The firm is using all its available help, domestic and foreign, on the other three adjoining strawberry ranches, the Hagaman, the Old Stage, and the Esperanza. For lack of workers, it is letting 500 acres of ready-to-pick strawberries spoil at Stolich Ranch.

"Not a berry has been touched on this spread," Mr. Lopez told the reporter after first making a 3-mile circle around the field.

"You work strawberries in a cycle," the grower's agent explained. "You spray, weed, water, and pick, over and over in that cycle, all season long, from April almost to November. We just didn't have enough workers when we needed them. That was why we wrote this field off and concentrated on the other three ranches."

UNION CHARGES DECEIT

Meanwhile, in Washington, George L. Mehren, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, said: "Weather conditions caused the crop to mature late and all at once, a condition which would strain even a perfect labor situation."

The California Labor Federation insists strawberry growers in the Salinas Valley are "deliberately deceiving" the public. Leaflets sent out from the AFL-CIO office in San Francisco imply the growers may be "in collusion" with banks and big allied farm industries.

"Why don't the union people come out here and make those ridiculous charges?" asked J. (Bud) Vukasovich, headman at Salinas Strawberries' field freezing plant. "The trouble is unions never have to prove their statements."

CONTRACT GROUP DECLINES

The union contends growers are trying to panic Washington into meeting their demands for more foreign workers instead of trying to recruit domestic workers. Mr. Pitts argues that there would be no shortage of domestic workers if the growers were willing to provide wages, housing, and working conditions comparable to benefits in other industries.

California farms hired 271,000 domestic workers at the peak of last year's harvest, and 64,400 foreign contract workers. Use of braceros had been dropping every year since 1957. That year the farmers hired 94,100 foreign nationals, mostly Mexicans.

Braceros worked chiefly on lettuce, strawberries, asparagus, tomatoes, lemons, and sugar beets. All the sugar used in Mr. Vukasovich's freezing plant comes from sugar beets grown and processed in the valley. The fields back up close to the tawny foothills where the ranchers run beef and dairy cattle.

During the peak of the 1962 season, tomato growers hired 43,700 braceros. Strawberry growers came next with 17,000. Asparagus was third with 9,250.

Washington blames the growers for this year's strawberry losses. "The growers haven't tried all-out programs to recruit American farm workers," says Glenn E. Brockway, the Labor Department's regional administrator in San Francisco. "Strawberry growers in Monterey County merely persisted in their contention that their operations are uniquely based on bracero labor."

AMERICAN WORKERS RISE

Mr. Brockway says the big labor turnover in Salinas strawberry work has been ascribed to everything except growers' failure to provide decent housing, wages, supervision, and working conditions.

Has the virtual ban on braceros this season helped domestic workers?

"Right now there are 5,100 more American farm workers in the valley than a year ago," said DeWitt Tannehill, business agent for

June 22, 1965

A3270

the AFL-CIO's Agricultural workers Organizing Committee.

"The trouble is," interposed Floyd Quick, "growers make it so rough on domestic workers they are discouraged from coming here." He and Mr. Tannehill are busy trying to recruit new members for the AWOC in the Salinas Valley.

FIELD FLOODING REPORTED

Growers are accused of driving away domestic job seekers. How?

"For one thing," says Mr. Quick, "the growers are too slow in processing job seekers. They wear them out keeping them standing around waiting to be registered and put to work in the fields. One trick the growers have is flooding a field so that workers have to wait two or three days for the mud to dry before they can work it."

The union agent charged that the growers flooded their fields at the start of a week-end when 1,500 volunteer berry pickers showed up from as far away as Los Angeles and Phoenix. This was after the State labor office sent out an urgent request for volunteers to help pick strawberries for Salinas Strawberries, Inc.

Leaning across the desk in his air-cooled office at the firm's freezer plant, Mr. Vukasovich swept aside these charges. He says the company has not turned away anybody looking for work. He denies it is slow in processing workers, denies that growers turn their farms into quagmires to keep workers away.

TOTALS POINTED OUT

Actually, the firm processed nearly all the 1,500 who came to pick strawberries on the peak weekend, Mr. Vukasovich says. He tossed a sheaf of records that he submits to the U.S. Government showing how many workers are hired each day, how many hours they work, and how much they receive in wages and piece rates.

He pointed to the Saturday and Sunday job totals, running into the hundreds. "You're welcome to add them up," he said. "Does that look as if we chased anybody away?" He said the company has every incentive to process job seekers quickly. Ripening fruit does not wait.

On the critical weekend, he said, the firm signed up nearly 1,500 volunteers. "The most the State employment office here ever processed in a day is about 300."

While touring the four big strawberry farms, Mr. Lopez pointed to a worker letting irrigation water into the furrows. He suggested this might be what the union had in mind in its complain about flooding out workers.

"You will notice that while this strip is being watered, that group of workers over there is weeding, and the group way out beyond them is picking strawberries. These operations are all part of the work cycle I mentioned."

STRIP PICKED EARLIER

"It's true you can't work this irrigated strip for a day or two. That strip was picked yesterday by one of our work teams. Later we will spray and then weed and by that time it will be about ready to pick again. We'd be crazy to flood so much land all at once. We couldn't keep our cycle going."

Union criticism of California's farm-labor camps makes Mr. Vukasovich wince, he says. When Secretary Wirtz was here in March, he cited the workers' houses and food furnished by Salinas Strawberries as "models" of cleanliness and wholesome food, Mr. Vukasovich declared.

The company says it is paying the minimum \$1.40 hourly wage set by Secretary Wirtz. The union says the growers are using that figure as a ceiling rather than a floor.

Mr. Vukasovich's eyes blazed. Out came

another sheaf of reports, this time showing picking costs day by day. A breakdown of these tabulations for May 30 showed that one team of 50 braceros picked 769 crates in 9 hours at Old Stage Ranch. This was an average of 15.3 crates per man per day. The crew was working on freezer berries. Strawberries which are not picked soon enough for the fresh-fruit market are sent to the freezer plant. The firm pays pickers \$1 a crate for freezer fruit. This team's pay for the day came to \$15.30 a man. This was 30 cents an hour above the \$1.40 hourly work rate set by Secretary Wirtz.

Earlier, out at the Esperanza, a Chinese girl working as a strawberry checker showed this reporter what some Japanese boys were making. It was then 2:30 in the afternoon, and one worker had 27 slant marks on the day's tally sheet.

"Here he comes now," she beamed. A wiry youngster trotted up to the checker with his heaping tray, checked in with a grin, and trotted back to his furrow.

FIFTY-DOLLAR-A-DAY TOP QUOTED

Some of these pickers make up to \$50 in a day, according to Mr. Vukasovich.

But Mr. Tannehill and Mr. Quick feel as sure as their AFL-CIO leaders that what is happening out on Stolich Ranch is a hoax, a "phony" disaster. Rather, perhaps, because nothing is happening out at Stolich.

Except for a lonely irrigator or two on its 3-mile circumference, the ranch sits forlornly in a tangle of weeds redolent with strawberries. Now and then a red-winged blackbird dips in the rolling-green distance, accentuating the farm's forgotten, empty look.

Chatting in their cramped union quarters nine blocks out on East Alisal Street, the AWOC strategists have it figured like this:

"A big strawberry spread always has some marginal plantings—fields where the plants are about played out and ready to be plowed under and replanted."

PANIC ACTION CHARGED

"We think the company spokesmen are trying to inflame the public against us and panic the Government into bringing back braceros. You couldn't quite say they're making a virtue out of necessity because there's no virtue in deceiving the public. Let's just say they are making a big Federal case out of nothing. At least they're trying to."

All this, says Salinas Strawberries management, is a little too pat.

"It is true the Stolich vines are in their fourth year," says Mr. Vukasovich. "Normally we plow under the plants after they stop bearing on the fourth year. By that time, the plants are beginning to fall off in yield. This is the first time we ever lost a crop for lack of workers."

"What makes it even worse is that this year the spring rains were just right. This fourth-year growth on the Stolich was better than it was a year ago. Already we have lost a million crates out there."

LOSS SET AT \$2,350,000

Mr. Vukasovich paused as though lost for words. Then he added, "A million crates of fresh strawberries at \$2.35 a crate. And the union charges we are deliberately throwing that away?" The manager tossed another report across the desk.

This time it was the company's 1964 cost sheet:

"Take that along with you. Study it. Why, the rent on the Stolich Ranch for the first 6 months of this year comes to \$35,000—that's \$70,000 we'd be throwing away on this year's lease, and for what—just to let the crop spoil."

The boss' voice rose above the rattle of conveyor belts in the processing room next door:

"For a while I was getting calls every morning from buyers in London, Frankfurt, Oslo, Copenhagen."

PHONE ORDERS REJECTED

"These union people say the most irresponsible things. Do you think we like to tell those people on the telephone it's no use calling us any more. Or that somehow it suits us to see those 500 acres of strawberries rotting out there on the Stolich."

Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address I delivered at the commencement exercises of the Regional Vocational Technical School at Norwich, Conn., in my district, on Monday, June 21, 1965. The theme of my address was the role of vocational education today and ways to improve such education.

The address was as follows:

NO ROOM AT THE BOTTOM

Mr. Rooke, Reverend clergy, members of the graduating class, parents and friends, thank you for the gracious reception you have given me. I am delighted to be here with you in Norwich again, and I am especially pleased to have been invited to attend this graduation ceremony. As a one-time member of the school board in Putnam, as a parent, and as the Representative in Congress from this area, I am deeply interested in education and in the educational process generally. I believe with President Johnson that education belongs at the head of our national work agenda, that schooling must be the No. 1 business of our country. You young people have made it your business over the past years. Your very presence at today's commencement testifies to the success you have attained in that business.

If I could impress but one fact upon you today, I would like for it to be this: The business of education must go on for each of you, even after graduation. Today should represent the completion of only one stage in your educational progress, not the end of the process itself. We live in a world of change, and education is our best tool for coping with change. You are ready to begin your working lives in this changing world. In order for your work to be successful and rewarding, there must also be room in your future for continuing education. Dr. Grant Venn, a leading educator and keen observer of the American school scene, has stated in his book, "Man, Education, and Work" as follows:

"Today's accelerating and changing technology has placed man, his education, and his work in a new relationship in which education becomes the bridge between man and his work."

Now, your first thoughts may be that this has always been the case in America, and you will be right to a degree. For certain jobs—teaching, medicine, law, engineering, the professions in general—education has indeed been the bridge between man and his work since long before the beginning of our Nation. But there have been other large